COPYRIGHT ARBITRATION ROYALTY PANEL

+ + + +

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

+ + + +

HEARING

In the Matter of:

Adjustment of the Rates for | Noncommercial Educational | Broadcasting Compulsory | License

Docket No. 96-6 CARP NCBRA

Library of Congress
James Madison Building
101 Independence Avenue, S.E.
Room LM414
Washington, D.C. 20540

Thurday, March 19, 1998

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m.

BEFORE:

THE HONORABLE LEWIS HALL GRIFFITH, Chairperson THE HONORABLE EDWARD DREYFUS
THE HONORABLE JEFFREY S. GULIN

NEAL R. GROSS

APPEARANCES:

On Behalf of Broadcast Music, Inc.:

JOHN FELLAS, ESQ.

NORMAN C. KLEINBERG, ESQ.

MICHAEL E. SALZMAN, ESQ.

of: Hughes, Hubbard & Reed, LLP

One Battery Park Plaza

New York, New York 10004-1482

(212) 837-6075 (JF)

6680 (NCK)

6833 (MES)

and

JOSEPH J. DiMONA, ESQ. (Asst. V.P.)

MARVIN L. BERENSON, ESQ.

Legal and Regulatory Affairs

BMI

320 West 57th Street

New York, New York 10019-3790

(212) 830-3847

On Behalf of ASCAP:

I. FRED KOENIGSBERG, ESQ.

PHILIP H. SCHAEFFER, ESQ.

J. CHRISTOPHER SHORE, ESO.

SAMUEL MOSENKIS, ESQ.

of: White & Case, LLP

1155 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-2787

(212) 819-8740 (PHS)

8394 (JCS)

BEVERLY A. WILLETT, ESQ.

ASCAP Building

Sixth Floor

One Lincoln Plaza

New York, New York 10023

(212) 621-6289

NEAL R. GROSS

APPEARANCES (continued):

On Behalf of ASCAP:

JOAN M. McGIVERN, ESQ.
Assistant Vice President of Legal
Affairs
Office of the CEO
ASCAP
One Lincoln Plaza
New York, New York 10023
(212) 621-6289

On Behalf of the Public Broadcasters:

R. BRUCE RICH, ESQ.
JONATHAN T. WEISS, ESQ.
MARK J. STEIN, ESQ.
TRACEY I. BATT, ESQ.
ELIZABETH FORMINARD, ESQ.
of: Weil, Gotshal & Manges, LLP
767 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10153-0119
(212) 310-8170 (RBR)
8885 (JTW)
8969 (MJS)
8405 (TIB)

and

KATHLEEN COX, ESQ. (General Counsel)
ROBERT M. WINTERINGHAM, ESQ. (Staff Atty)
Corporation for Public Broadcasting
901 E Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2037
(202) 879-9701 (KC)
9707 (RMW)

and

NEAL R. GROSS

APPEARANCES (continued):

On Behalf of the Public Broadcasters:

GREGORY FERENBACH, ESQ.,

(Vice Pres. & Acting General Counsel)

ANN W. ZEDD, ESQ. (Asst. Gen. Counsel)

KAREN C. RINDNER, ESQ. (Asst. Gen.

Counsel)

PBS 1320 Braddock Place Alexandria, Virginia 22314 (703) 739-5063 (GF) 5170 (AWZ)

NEAL A. JACKSON, ESQ.

DENISE B. LEARY, ESQ.

GREGORY A. LEWIS, ESQ.

Deputy General Counsel

National Public Radio

635 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20001

(202) 414-2000 (NPR)

2049 (DBL)

ALSO PRESENT:

GINA GIUFFREDA, CARP Specialist TAMALA T. BOYD, Legal Assistant, White and Case ALBERT ALDERETE, Legal Assistant, Weil, Gotshal & Manges, LLP

NEAL R. GROSS

т	-N	r _ 1	Γ	┖	-X	
1	- T/	т.	-ע	£	1	

<u>WITNESS</u>	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	REC	CROSS	
Michael Bacon By Mr. Kleinberg By Mr. Weiss By Mr. Schaeffer	1585	1606 1640	1633			
Roy Epstein						
By Mr. Salzman	1659		1694			
Voir Dire by Mr.	Salzman		1643			
By Mr. Weiss	T-7	1666	C 4 F		1697	
Voir Dire by Mr.	weiss on	page 1	645			
Peter Boyle						
By Mr. Shore	1707		1936			
By Mr. Rich		1791			1944	
By Mr. Kleinberg		1942				
Exhibit No.	<u>Descr</u>	<u>iption</u>		<u>Mark</u>	<u>Recd</u>	
מת						
<u>PB</u>						
20X Licens:	ing with I	BMI		1613	1632	
	cue sheet		Boss	1637		
22X 06-10-9	92 Opinio	n		1813		
23X 10-08-8	37 Transc	ript		1843	1846	
24X CPB FY	1990			1867	1872	
25X CBP FY	1985			1867	1872	
	Iouse Test	_		1873	1884	
	rehearing	-	sion		1891	
28X Ross Ch	narap Test	imony		1901	1909	
BMI						
aura is also						
1 Earning	gs			1592	1702	
2 Music o	1634	1637				
3 Dr. Owe	Dr. Owen's charts					

NEAL R. GROSS

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(9:32 a.m.)
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. Let the
4	record reflect that the court reporter has been
5	previously sworn and remains under oath.
6	Ladies and gentlemen, good morning.
7	We are ready to go, I presume.
8	MR. KLEINBERG: We are.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
10	MR. KLEINBERG: BMI will call as its next
11	witness, Michael Bacon.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Mr. Bacon?
13	Whereupon,
14	MICHAEL BACON
15	was called as a witness, and having been first duly
16	sworn, assumed the witness stand, was examined and
17	testified as follows:
18	DIRECT EXAMINATION
19	BY: MR. KLEINBERG
20	Q Would you state your name please?
21	A Michael Bacon.
22	Q Mr. Bacon, tell the Panel what you do for

1	a living.
2	A I compose and produce music for films and
3	television shows.
4	Q And could you tell the Panel a little bit
5	about your background in music?
6	A I started out playing the cello when I was
7	eight years old. Later on, I played the oboe, playing
8	in orchestras in Philadelphia, taking private lessons.
9	At the same time, I always had an interest
10	in folk and popular music; I played the banjo and
11	guitar.
12	When I got into college I played in rock
13	bands and shortly after college I became a performer
14	int he pop music field, recording several records with
15	groups and on my own for major labels.
16	I toured around the world and played in
17	coffee houses and colleges. At the time I was living
18	in Nashville, a very old friend of mine who was a film
19	maker asked me to write a song for one of his
20	documentaries.
21	He liked what I did and some other friends
22	of his heard what I did and asked me to do the same

1	thing. Eventually, I started writing songs for films.
2	Gradually, more demands were made or
3	writing instrumental music so I went back to school to
4	study orchestration and composition.
5	About thirteen years ago I gave up
6	performing and moved to New York to pursue writing
7	music for films and television, which I do pretty much
8	most of my time.
9	I am also in a band with my brother and we
10	tour around the country playing occasionally.
11	Q What per centage of your composing work is
12	done with respect to composing music for television
13	programs?
14	A Ninety per cent.
15	Q Of that ninety per cent how much, on
16	average, have you spent composing music for public
17	broadcasting programs?
18	A PBS has been around 60 per cent.
19	Q And could you tell the Panel some of the
20	PBS shows that you have composed music for? You can
21	refer to your written testimony if you would like,
22	sir.

1	A A lot of my work is done for a series out
2	of Boston called the American Experience. They do the
3	president series which is about to include seven
4	presidents, most recently profiling Ronald Reagan.
5	Most of the shows are about four hours long.
6	My tenure at WGBH is now up to about fifty
7	hours of programming.
8	I also work with Bill Moyers on PBS. We
9	do other profiles for American Experience: Amelia
10	Ehrhart, Admiral Byrd, the Wright Brothers, the
11	Hurricane of 1938; Johnstown Flood, which won an
12	Academy Award in the film version.
13	The score that I wrote for the Kennedys
14	won me an Emmy Award. There are other shows: The
15	Windsors, The Story of Lassie, and Discovering Women.
16	Q And the Emmy Award was for what, the music
17	composition?
18	A For the music composition for The
19	Kennedys.
20	Q And The Kennedys was one of the American
21	Experience shows?
22	A Right.

1	Q Could you tell the Panel some of the
2	commercial network programs you have composed music
3	for?
4	A I would say my biggest client outside of
5	PBS is the ABC News Group. I do a lot of work with
6	Peter Jennings and am involved in a very long form
7	show with him dealing with the history of the
8	Twentieth Century.
9	A very highly rated show called Turning
10	Point; I have done about 20 of those over the years.
11	Also, I work for A&E, Biography Channel,
12	the Learning Channel, the Discovery Channel, all the
13	major networks.
14	Q Could you tell the Panel about how much of
15	your time in hours and weeks you spend composing music
16	in a given year?
17	A Well, it is a pretty time-intensive job.
18	I am usually in the office about 8:30 a.m. and get
19	home about the same time at night. I take a couple of
20	weeks off a year. I would say that it is about 60
21	hours a week of pretty intense work to get all the
22	work that I need to done.

1	Q In your written testimony you have
2	indicated that you received BMI royalties, correct?
3	A Yes.
4	Q You also mentioned that, as a composer,
5	you receive up-front fees. Is that also correct?
6	A Right.
7	Q The up-front fees that you receive when
8	you are doing composing for television, do you have to
9	pay expenses out of those up-front fees?
LO	A Yes. Essentially I do a package deal. If
L1	someone hires me to write a show, for that amount of
L2	money, I am responsible for hiring musicians if
L3	necessary, hiring the recording studio, all the
L4	incidental costs, tape, all those kinds of things.
L5	So, any particular show can include a per
L6	centage of out-of-pocket expenses for me.
L7	Q I think that you have indicated in your
L8	written testimony that about one third of the up-front
L9	fees are consumed in by the expenses that you incur in
20	composing, such as paying the musicians and studio
21	costs?
22	A Right. As a general rule, if the show

1	requires musicians, about 25 per cent goes to that and
2	another 10 per cent to studio costs and tape and all
3	that sort of thing comes out of my pocket.
4	Q Mr. Bacon, I want to direct your attention
5	to page three of your written testimony.
6	You indicated there that, with reference
7	to BMI exhibit 61 which is described as your BMI 1996
8	earnings statement.
9	Could you turn to exhibit 61 if you have
10	it?
11	A Sure.
12	Q Could you tell the Panel what that earning
13	statement is for. I guess I should say for the
14	Panel's edification that I have already informed Mr.
15	Rich that I am going to clarify something from the
16	written testimony that I think needs to be clarified.
17	That is, the royalty statement that is
18	listed under exhibit 61 is for your writer's share of
19	BMI royalties, is that correct?
20	A Right.
21	Q As stated, exhibit 61 does not include any
22	publisher royalties that you have received, correct?

1	A Yes.
2	Q Do you have a music publishing company?
3	A Yes, I do.
4	Q What is the name of it?
5	A MIMSA; music publishing.
6	Q We have prepared, Your Honors, and showed
7	to counsel for PBS, an exhibit which will also include
8	the music publishing royalty for that year so that we
9	have a full review.
LO	I believe that PBS has no objection to
L1	that.
L2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
L3	MR. WEISS: We have no objection, Your
L4	Honor.
L5	Q And I guess we will mark that
L6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: BMI Hearing Exhibit
L7	Number 1, I believe.
L8	MR. KLEINBERG: I think that is correct.
L9	(WHEREUPON, THE DOCUMENT
20	REFERRED TO WAS MARKED AS BMI'S
21	EXHIBIT NO. 1 FOR
22	IDENTIFICATION.)

NEALR. GROSS

1	Q Just so the record is clear, the BMI
2	Hearing Exhibit Number 1 shows that your music
3	publishing earnings under MIMSA for 1996 totaled
4	\$11,346.96, correct?
5	A Yes.
6	Q Of which, the earnings attributed to PBS
7	performances were \$2,141.96, correct?
8	A Right.
9	Q Then the total BMI combined royalties that
10	you and your publishing company received were
11	\$55,375.64. The combined royalties attributed to PBS
12	were \$6,140.87.
13	Is that right, Mr. Bacon?
14	A Yes.
15	Q And when you take the total of your BMI
16	writer and publisher earnings that you have received
17	from BMI, the amount attributed to PBS equals 11 per
18	cent of the total, is that correct?
19	A Right; 11 per cent.
20	Q And that is in contrast to 60 per cent of
21	your work done in composing for PBS, correct?
22	A Right.

	Q	Now,	would	you	br	efly	y descr	ibe	for	the
Panel	what	the	proce	ess	of	com	posing	mu	sic	for
television programs, such as the documentaries tha									that	
you ha	ave ta	lked a	about,	enta	ails	3.				

A My way of operating is to start very early. A lot of composers wait until a later time. But I like to begin very early in a project.

What will normally happen, particularly with PBS shows is as long as a year in advance, an editor will call me up and say, as one did for example for a show called LBJ that I did, I need a two minute section of music that would describe LBJ's sinking into the depths of Viet Nam after the Gulf of Tonkin incident and after two minutes there should be a very intense 10 second moment, and then it should change mood and become more neutral.

So, I'll take these words and try to create a piece of music based on what he has told me. I haven't seen any pictures as of yet. I will make a synthesizer demo of it and I'll send if over to him, he will listen and put it into the picture.

Then he will give me feedback such as it

NEAL R. GROSS

1	is too dark or there is too much movement in it, and
2	maybe I will redo it.
3	He will then take this and maybe try it
4	somewhere else in the film.
5	In the meantime, other editors might be
6	calling me up to write other sections.
7	I am also at that point working on a main
8	theme which is supposed to capture, in the sense of
9	LBJ, the person as a whole, at his best, maybe a theme
10	at his worst.
11	Some of these shows may have 10 or 12
12	themes that reoccur for different meaning within the
13	show.
14	The process goes on until about six weeks
15	before the show is actually finished. At that point,
16	all the music that is going to go into the show has
17	already been demoed with synthesizers.
18	At that point, I go and replace whatever
19	amount of the synthesizers with real musicians, based
20	on the budget.
21	Musicians are either brought into my
22	studio or another studio that I rent. They are added

1	to the synthesizers. You mix these all together to
2	make it sound proper and you have to synchronize it
3	with the film and deliver it on time.
4	Then the music is mixed with the dialogue
5	and the sound effects and the film is finished.
6	Q Is the process that you have just
7	described generally the process that applies when you
8	are doing documentaries for PBS scoring or composing
9	for PBS documentaries?
1.0	A Yes, that is pretty much standard.
11	Q Now, take the American Experience
12	documentaries, the presidents ones you have described,
13	how long are those documentaries?
14	A The running time is usually about four to
15	four and a half hours.
16	Q And, how much music, on average, do you
17	compose for each hour of the documentary?
18	A It is usually about 2/3 is music.
19	Q For each hour?
20	A For each hour, yes.
21	Q In your written testimony you referred to
22	theme music in PBS documentaries as being longer.

1	Could you explain what you mean by that?
2	A Well, particularly in the presidents
3	series, it is very important to capture this person as
4	a musical statement because that helps link together
5	the whole show with disparate elements.
6	So, we spend a lot of time and energy
7	trying to figure out what two minute long theme is
8	going to capture someone as opposed to news shows the
9	music is almost supposed to disappear.
10	In a lot of the PBS shows the music is
11	very prominent and identifiable with the person.
12	Q Now, is one of the American Experience
13	shows you composed music about Teddy Roosevelt, TR?
14	A Right.
15	Q And you are aware that we have a tape with
16	some excerpts from that?
17	A Yes.
18	Q With the Panel's permission, we will show
19	a little bit of that. We are not going to play the
20	whole tape; the Panel will have it available.
21	(Whereupon, the videotape played).
22	(Whereupon, the proceedings were recessed

1	from 9:46 a.m. until 9:50 a.m.)
2	Q Well, we have a copy of the tape for the
3	Panel which they can view at their pleasure.
4	Mr. Bacon, I think now we are going to
5	need to go into Executive Session.
6	MR. SCHAEFFER: Is that for lawyers' eyes
7	only?
8	MR. KLEINBERG: Yes.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right, everyone
10	left now is under the protective order. So we will
11	commence an Executive Session.
12	(Whereupon, the proceedings went
13	immediately into Executive Session.)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

1	MR. SHORE: At some point, when we get
2	into the details of Appendix B, which has been filed
3	under seal all along, we'll have to close the hearing.
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. Other
5	than that though, we at this time are out of the
6	executive session and back into our regular open
7	hearing?
8	MR. SHORE: That is correct.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: And just let the
10	record reflect that this is a resumption of ASCAP's
11	direct case.
12	All right, are you ready to proceed?
13	MR. SHORE: Dr. Boyle, would you please
14	introduce yourself to the Arbitrators?
15	DR. BOYLE: Yes, my name is Peter Boyle.
16	I am Vice President and Chief Economist for ASCAP.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Oh, the court
18	reporter has reminded me that maybe we should place
19	him under oath.
20	(Laughter.)
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Would you agree
22	with that?

1	MR. SHORE: Sure.
2	WHEREUPON,
3	DR. PETER BOYLE
4	was called as a witness, and having first been duly
5	sworn was examined and testified as follows:
6	DIRECT EXAMINATION
7	BY MR. SHORE:
8	Q Dr. Boyle, would you reintroduce your self
9	to the Arbitrators?
10	A I am Peter Boyle. I am vice president and
11	chief economist for ASCAP. I joined ASCAP in 1985 as
12	the chief economist and became vice president in 1995.
13	Q Can you describe to the Arbitrators your
14	duties currently?
15	A I am fortunate in my position. I get to
16	be involved in pretty much the broad range of ASCAP's
17	operations. In terms of licensing activities, I'd be
18	involved in preparing license fee proposals we make to
19	our customers. I participate in the negotiations
20	generally. I evaluate counter proposals made by the
21	other side. In those cases where we are not able to
22	reach agreement at the bargaining table, I prepare

material for court proceedings or CARP proceedings such as this. I get involved in preparing our proposal, testifying if necessary.

Besides the licensing activities, once we collect money from our customers, we have to pay that money out to the writers and publishers, our members who had music performed by our various customers. We can really break those functions into two parts.

We do a survey to determine what music is performed. I have overall responsibility for our various surveys of performances. I work with independent survey experts to make sure that the surveys are representative and our members are all treated fairly, and all the various performances have an opportunity of coming into the survey. Not all of them will. In some cases we do samples, but we want to make sure that all of the performances have an opportunity of coming into the survey.

Once we have identified what music is performed, we also have to value that to turn it into payments to our members, to turn it into dollars.

That part of our operations involves a distribution

NEAL R. GROSS

system, where we have a variety of weights and values that are applied to the individual performances. I have overall responsibility for that as well.

Whenever there are changes made to that,

I participate in preparing the material for those
changes, reporting it to the board of directors for
their approval, reporting it to the Department of
Justice and the courts when necessary for their
approval.

also work with our membership and foreign relations staffs in terms of explaining our surveys and distribution systems to members, answering members' questions. In the international scene, to make sure that our members are being treated fairly for performances overseas, and to explain how we treat performances of foreign writers and publishers when they occur in the United States their representatives for the various performing rights societies throughout the world.

Q Could you please give the Arbitrators a brief description of your educational and professional background?

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

A In terms of my educational background, I attended school here in Washington, D.C. I went to Georgetown University. I received a bachelor of arts degree in economics from Georgetown in 1976. I received my masters degree also from Georgetown, with a concentration in economics in 1978. I received my Ph.D. in economics from Georgetown in 1982.

Prior to working at ASCAP, I worked for three years for the Federal Aviation Administration. The FAA has a technical center outside Atlantic City where they do a lot of their research and development engineering work. I did a variety of planning, budgeting, cost benefit analysis for the FAA.

Prior to that, I worked for an economic consulting firm here in Washington, D.C. for three years. The firm Nathan Associates is ASCAP's, was at that time and it still is, ASCAP's independent survey experts. I spent part of my time working on a variety of survey design issues. That's how I first became acquainted with ASCAP. I also worked on a variety of other general economic issues, cost of capital issues, transportation freight rates, railroad rates, labor

NEAL R. GROSS

1.8

1	questions, a whole variety of general questions over
2	the course of those three years.
3	Q You mentioned testifying in rate setting
4	litigation. Can you describe that further?
5	A Sure. Part of my responsibility at ASCAP
6	would be to present the economic basis for our
7	proposals. I have testified in at least four, I
8	believe, rate proceedings in the federal court and
9	southern district court to determine reasonable ASCAP
10	license fees. I have testified in several prior
11	proceedings before the Copyright Royalty Tribunal for
12	a variety of fee issues. I think this is the first
13	time I have had the opportunity to appear before one
14	of the CARP panels.
15	Q Could you describe the purpose of your
16	testimony here today?
17	A My purpose of my testimony is to present
18	the ASCAP's fee proposal for the fees that we think
19	are reasonable and appropriate for the public radio
20	and public television stations that are covered by
21	this license to pay for the access to and use of our
22	members' music.
	1 .

1	Q How did you go about forming your opinion?
2	A (No response.)
3	MR. KLEINBERG: Excuse me. I'm not
4	hearing.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Could you keep your
6	voice up a little bit, Dr. Boyle, please?
7	MR. SCHAEFFER: Is the microphone not
8	working or
9	BY MR. SHORE:
LO	Q Could you describe how you came about
11	deriving your opinions?
L2	A (No response.)
13	MR. SHORE: Do you guys have a voir dire?
14	MR. RICH: We guys don't.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
L6	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. What was the
L7	question?
L8	BY MR. SHORE:
L9	Q Could you describe for the Arbitrators how
20	you came about forming your opinions?
21	A That is an issue that ASCAP faces all the
22	time when we have to quote license fees to either new

1	customers or existing customers. The first thing we
2	would normally do and again in this case was to take
3	a look at the industry in which the radio and TV
4	stations at issue here belong. We take a look at
5	prior license agreements with that industry, prior
6	negotiated agreements or agreements that were
7	determined by the courts or other panels, if
8	necessary.
9	Then we would take account of any changes
10	in circumstances, typically encapsulated in revenue
11	and music use information from the time of the prior
12	arrangements.
13	In this case, dealing with over-the-air
14	broadcasters, radio and television broadcasters here
15	operating under FCC licenses
16	JUDGE DREYFUS: Could you keep your voice
17	up, please?

THE WITNESS: Certainly I'll try.

sorry.

We had a variety of other benchmarks to look at. We had prior negotiated agreements with the public television, radio, and public radio

18

19

20

21

broadcasters. We had prior negotiated agreements with the commercial television networks. We have court determined agreements, court-determined fees for the commercial television networks. We had court-determined fees for the local television stations and the agreement that was negotiated pursuant to that determination. So we looked at those benchmarks to prepare the proposal we're submitting here.

BY MR. SHORE:

Q Specifically, which benchmarks did you look at in determining the reasonable rates for these particular television stations and radio stations?

A Well, first turned to the prior agreements that were negotiated between the parties. Those were arms-length agreements across the bargaining table, and unfortunately found that we couldn't use those here because they have an explicit provision that those agreements, those prior agreements are non-precedential and are not to be used in future rate setting. That was one of the terms as part of the whole package we bargained for. Couldn't rely on those agreements in this situation.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	That being the case, I then turned to the
2	commercial broadcasting industry to take a look at the
3	negotiated and court-set agreements for commercial,
4	radio, and TV broadcasters, and tried as I think I may
5	have just mentioned, to take account of similarities
6	and differences between that group of broadcasters and
7	the public radio and TV stations that are performing
8	ASCAP music here.
9	Q What similarities and differences did you
10	focus on?
11	A I focused again primarily on the economic
12	similarities and differences that would be summarized

in terms of the respective revenues of the two industries and also the manner in which and the amount of music they use, taking into account adjustments for use of music as well.

How did you go about taking that into consideration?

Well, if I could perhaps use the board, I set up a relationship that's shown in paragraph 7 on page 3 of the testimony. The starting point was the revenue the commercial broadcasters receive.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

reported by various government sources. Also took a look at the license fees that were paid to ASCAP pursuant to either negotiated agreements or under the fees determined by the courts in those cases. That is one part of the revenue side of things.

The other thing we had to take a look at was the revenue for the public broadcasting entities. In this case, relying on information provided by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting when they do some adjustments to the revenue, and focused on the revenue from private sources. We deducted any of the revenue from public sources, state or government funding, federal funding, federal or state funding, colleges and universities. So strictly revenue from private sources.

In the case of public television, that was going to take out about half of the revenue from the various public television stations. In the case of radio, it was more like 39 percent of the revenue was deducted there. So those between them really took care of the revenue side of things.

The next point, as I mentioned, is any

NEALR. GROSS

differences in music uses. Here we took a look at the average music use per hour for the public stations, public broadcasters, and compared that to music use on an hourly basis for commercial broadcasters.

We did separate calculations for both the radio and the television sides of the business here, but using the same general formula for each.

Q Can you explain a little bit further why you considered the license fees paid to ASCAP by commercial broadcasters to be a relevant benchmark?

Α Well remember, we couldn't look at the fees previously that were agreed negotiations with the public broadcasters. One of the parts of that agreement was explicitly that those fees would non-precedential. be The commercial broadcasters have some similarities. They operate over the air, they operate under FCC licenses, they have essentially the same parts of the spectrum, they are providing programming in essentially the same technical way. So we want to take a look at the fees that the broadcasters agree with us to pay and we agree to accept for the fees that were set by the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

court, if that was the case and related it to their revenue. We get an effective rate, essentially, to what the commercial broadcast industry had agreed to and what the courts had approved.

On the opposite side then, we took a look at the revenue base for public broadcasting to get an idea of their revenue relative to commercial broadcasters, making as I mentioned, some adjustments for the sources of that revenue to get an idea of the economic situation, the respective economic situations of the public and commercial broadcasters.

Q We'll come back to some of these portions of the formula in a bit. Can you explain how you gathered data to input into your formula?

A Well, one of the factors that affected the calculations we did was the obtaining information from the public broadcasting sector. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting publishes reports on the economics of the public broadcasting sector. The last one that we had available at the time we were preparing the testimony was for fiscal year 1995. So that being the case, we wanted to try to get comparable figures for

the other parts of the analysis, for the commercial world and for the music use information.

The Commerce Department, Bureau of the Census, publishes information on the revenue for commercial broadcasters in some of their annual reports on communication service industries. We were able to obtain figures for calendar year 1995 from the government. This is a fiscal year, so there's three months difference. This would not include, as I understand it, October, November, December 1995, but it would have included October, November, December 1994.

For the license fees, we keep track of that in our normal accounting records so we knew what was paid to us by the broadcasters in 1995.

In terms of the music use, we do the survey of performances that I discussed briefly and our distribution system. So we went to our records there to pull information for our survey year, which actually corresponds to the fiscal year the public broadcasters reported. So the music use data here and the revenue for public broadcasting were on the same

NEALR. GROSS

time	period.		Thi	s rati	o was	for	a	three	month
sligh	tly	differ	ent	period	, thre	e mon	ths	diffe	rent.

Q Would you please run through the revenue calculations for commercial television?

Α Sure. The Census report I believe is contained in the binder behind the tab that says is Appendix There the annual survey of communications services. The first page, table 11, deals with radio. The second page, table 12, deals with television. The first column is for 1995. Under the operating revenue, the first line of total operating revenue is for television \$25.155 billion, revenue for the commercial television broadcasters.

We then took a look at collections, the amounts paid to us in that same year from the commercial television broadcasters. That is \$110.9 million. So the effective rate, if you divide the two, is 44/100ths of one percent, .0044 or essentially 44 cents out of every \$100 in revenue is being paid by the commercial television broadcasters for access to the ASCAP repertory, where you see the compositions written and published by our members.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1.6

17

18

19

20

21

1	Q Turning to the revenues for public
2	broadcasters.
3	A That information, as I believe I said was
4	prepared and reported by the Corporation for Public
5	Broadcasting. Two or three tabs back is a tab labeled
6	"1995 CPB Report," which is headed "Public
7	Broadcasting Revenue for Fiscal Year 1995."
8	If you go into page 5 of that, which is
9	table 2, that's the source of the data we used. I
10	suppose if you don't mind, I'd look at this because we
11	made some deductions. It might be good to summarize
12	those.
13	The total revenue, which is shown on the
14	bottom line of that table for fiscal year 1995, which
15	is about in the center, maybe a little to the right of
16	center, that column, there are three lines. There's
17	a total for public broadcasting. Then there is one
18	labeled PT, which is a total for public television,
19	and PR, which is the total for public radio.
20	So the total revenue in fiscal year 1995
21	for TV was \$1.464 billion. In radio, the reported

revenue was \$453.1 million. If you add those up, you

get the total of nearly \$2 billion in revenue that's shown in that report.

Now that accounts for the revenue from all sources, although there are a couple of caveats and suppose. qualifications Ι We didn't have any individual station by station information to see if this was strictly a summary of that or if there were any adjustments. There are some references in the report to certain off balance sheet items that may or may not be relevant. Some of them were labeled things like public performances, so there's a question as to whether they should be included in any revenue base.

I understand that there are some public radio stations in particular that are part of this proceeding that don't get funding directly from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. It's not clear from the report itself whether they were included in this revenue base or not, but this was the published information made available by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

We made some adjustments to that. We took out --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Dr. Boyle, let me interrupt you just a minute. You have the first number there, \$1.464 billion as TV. Is that TV or is that public broadcasting, TV and radio together?

THE WITNESS: No. PT is strictly public The line above that, television. PBis public broadcasting in total, with some of radio television. Then the PR is public radio. So it's \$1.464 billion for TV and \$453 million for radio, and a total of \$1.917 billion for all public broadcasting.

BY MR. SHORE:

Q You were describing what you took out.

A Right. We made an adjustment to this revenue stream. Essentially, we took out the first six line items, the items dealing with the various state and federal, what the CPB refers to as tax base revenue sources, the funding to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, federal grants, local and state government funding, state colleges and universities, other public colleges and universities.

So if you add those numbers up, in the case of public television, it's a deduction of \$722

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

million or just under half of the total, 49.3 percent of the total. So revenue from public sources.

In the case of radio, that was a deduction of \$176.6 million, which is 39 percent of the total revenue of \$453 million.

If you add those two figures up, that amounts to nearly \$900 million, \$898.8 million to be precise that we deducted.

The rationale really deals with the types of funding and programming and the mission of the public broadcasters. They have made the point several times that they have a government-sponsored mission, that they do things, they provide programming that might not be available over the commercial network. They do all those type of good things for public policy reasons. We were trying to find a way to reflect that in the analysis.

I think frankly from an economic perspective, I think I can make a good case and would prefer to use the top line, the total revenue. That's what's being made available. Those are the economic resources to deliver this programming to the viewers

throughout America or listeners in the case of radio.

But we were trying to find a reasonable way to reflect that difference between the public broadcasters and the commercial broadcasters. The CPB themselves refer to private revenue and the tax based or public revenue. So that seemed like a reasonable distinction to make in this case.

For purposes of our fee proposal then, we took the difference between those two to get private revenue. In fact, if you were to turn to page 13 of the report behind that tab, several pages in, one of the pie charts in the bottom right in fact shows the private revenue of 51 percent and tax based revenue at 49 percent for public television. The flip side of that page 14 shows similar figures for public radio. So it was the designation that CPB uses here.

That leaves \$741.9 million in private revenue for their television side of the stations, and \$276.5 million for the public radio stations. A total of just over \$1 billion, \$1.018 billion in private revenue for public television and radio stations as a whole that I would use and put back into the formula

that'	ន	on	the	oth	er	side	of	this	board,	and	that	1
will	fl	.ip	back	to	in	just	a	second	l .			

Q Just one question before you flip. That \$1 billion figure, what relation if any, is there between that amount of private revenue in programming which is run, in your mind?

Α Certainly a large portion of that is donations, payments that people make to have access to programming supplied the by public radio television stations, some of its grants from corporations and other private sources. I think it's all directly program related to provide the kind of programming that the public wants to see on television and listen to on the radio. A lot of it is revenue that generates from the pledge drives and things, all the other various fundraising activities.

So then the middle part of the equation on the other side deals with the revenue for the public broadcasting sector. That will be these two columns of numbers separately for radio and television. So on the TV side, that is \$741.9 million in revenue, by revenue from private sources.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

If you multiply that by the effective rate
in the commercial broadcasting stations, that would
mean a total fee of \$3.264 million.
Perhaps another way of looking at it is
that a subset of the commercial broadcasters with
revenue of about \$742 million would pay us on average

about \$3.2 million, \$3.264 million in license fees under the agreements that the broadcasters had agreed to or that the courts had set and approved, and were essentially saying once we have taken out the public revenue and focused on private revenue on the public broadcasting system, to the extent that that encapsulates economic differences, that would be an appropriate fee prior to any adjustment for the way music is used for the public broadcasting stations, to reflect their relative economic importance.

Q Could you quickly run through the revenue calculations for radio?

A (No response.)

MR. SCHAEFFER: Before you do that, shouldn't we --

MR. SHORE: No.

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1	MR. SCHAEFFER: BMI people are here.
2	MR. SHORE: No. There's nothing.
3	THE WITNESS: Sure. Let me see if I have
4	got enough room to do it here.
5	BY MR. SHORE:
6	Q Maybe you can take the formula off the
7	top, which is on page 7 of your testimony.
8	A That's a good idea.
9	Q There's an eraser on the floor.
10	A Actually would you be able to see it if I
11	did it on the flip chart here? Why don't we do radio
12	over here, leaving the formula aside, just putting the
13	numbers in.
14	In the radio case, the government
15	publication that we were looking at previously at
16	Appendix C, the Census Bureau survey of communications
17	services, table 11, shows that the commercial radio
18	stations had revenue of \$8.765 billion in 1995. So
19	that is the revenue base there.
20	Most stations paid ASCAP in that year,
21	licensees of \$110 million for their right to have
22	access to and use the ASCAP repertory. So the

effective rate there is 1.25 percent or \$1.25 out of every \$100 in revenue for the rights to access the music.

That reflects a couple of things. It reflects differences in the economic size of the industries. It also reflects differences in the way the music is used. We bargain with the radio industry. We recognize that the stations that use music at least use a lot of feature music. That is the primary focus of what they are doing to draw audience. There are news talk stations, and that is reflected in our fees as well.

This is really a blended and effective rate that takes account of the entire industry in their use. But it is a higher effective rate because they use more music, particularly feature uses than the television side would.

In terms of the revenue from public broadcasting, that was what was on the flip side there of \$276.5 million after we deducted the revenue from the public sources, the private sources. So that goes into the equation. You if you multiply the two, that

NEAL R. GROSS

would give you a figure of \$3.456 million, or that's what commercial radio broadcasters with revenue of \$276.5 million would pay in fees on average based on the agreements they have negotiated over time and that were in effect in 1995.

We're saying that having excluded the public funding and gotten down to private revenue on the radio side, that seems like an appropriate fee to be paid here, again, before any analysis or examination of similarities or differences and the way music is used by the public stations and commercial stations.

Q I am going to ask one more question before we close the hearings. Would you explain why you made music use adjustments to these fees which you have put on the board?

A There are a couple of reasons. One, to a certain extent the music use is built into the effective rate. As I just mentioned, one of the reasons the radio rate is 1.25 percent is because they use more music, particularly featured music. For music using stations, that is the staple of their

NEAL R. GROSS

programming that they use to attract audience and generate revenue. So there are differences between radio and television to start with.

Another is that at least anecdotally, and from prior experience with the survey, we knew that public broadcasting uses different amounts of music and uses music in different ways generally. programming is very important to the public broadcasters. It is particularly important during pledge periods. You see a lot more use of music programming that generate a lot of the revenue. So we felt that we ought to take a look at that and see if there were similarities or differences.

Another reason is that in one of the court cases we had when we dealt with Judge Connor for determination of the fees for two of the television networks, the ABC and CBS networks, that was one of the factors the judge looked at. He said that revenue in music use were appropriate to consider. That is after all the product they are buying, access to our repertory, use of our repertory, so we wanted to examine the facts and see if adjustments were

NEAL R. GROSS

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	necessary.
2	MR. SHORE: Okay. At this point we can
3	either break for lunch and keep the closed hearings to
4	one small session or we can close and then break for
5	lunch an keep it closed. Because I think it will take
6	probably a half hour or 40 minutes to get through the
7	closed portion of the hearings.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Mr. Rich, what is
9	your schedule again?
10	MR. RICH: I apologize for applying the
11	ointment. I had scheduled a call at 1:10, which I
12	guess will run until about 10 minutes to 2:00.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Do you want to
14	break now?
15	MR. SHORE: I am happy to start, but it
16	just means closing the hearings twice and excluding
17	people. But I'm more than happy to.
18	MR. SCHAEFFER: Why don't we break now.
19	JUDGE GULIN: If we break now, let's give
20	Mr. Rich an opportunity to eat some lunch after his
21	call.

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. RICH: Break until 2:00 then?

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: We'll take our
2	lunch and recess now. We'll reconvene at 2:00.
3	(Whereupon, at 12:42 p.m., the proceedings
4	recessed for lunch, to reconvene at 2:00 p.m.)
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N
2	(2:02 p.m.)
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Mr. Shore, before
4	you begin again, Judge Gulin was just reminding us
5	that we ought to inquire of one matter.
6	JUDGE GULIN: I just wanted to remind
7	counsel this is probably of particular interest to
8	ASCAP that the rules permit any party to amend
9	their official rate request until the filing of
10	proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law. I
11	don't think there is a requirement that it be done,
12	but since you have amended the direct testimony of Dr.
13	Boyle, you may wish to do that so it conforms with his
14	testimony.
15	MR. SCHAEFFER: We will do that.
16	JUDGE GULIN: Okay.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
18	MR. SCHAEFFER: Thank you.
19	MR. SHORE: At this point, ASCAP would
20	move to close the hearing, because we are going to get
21	into matters of proprietary data. It would only be
22	attorneys this will be attorneys' eyes only data.

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. Ladies
2	and gentlemen, we will go into executive session.
3	Anyone in the room who is not covered by the order
4	all right.
5	(Whereupon, the proceedings went
6	immediately into Executive Session.)
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

NEAL R. GROSS

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript in

the matter of:

Hearing: Adjustment of the Rates for

Noncommercial Educational

Broadcasting Compulsory License,

Docket No. 96-6 CARP NCBRA

Before:

Library of Congress

Copyright Arbitration Royalty Panel

Date:

March 19, 1998

Place:

Washington, DC

represents the full and complete proceedings of the aforementioned matter, as reported and reduced to typewriting.

Alexanter (